



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/599,402

09/28/2006

Alon Cohen

1582/8

6585

44696

7590

10/22/2009

DR. MARK M. FRIEDMAN

C/O BILL POLKINGHORN - DISCOVERY DISPATCH

9003 FLORIN WAY

UPPER MARLBORO, MD 20772

EXAMINER

WILLIS, JONATHAN U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2441

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/22/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mark\_f@friedpat.com

friedpat@yahoo.com

sharon\_l@friedpat.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/599,402	<b>Applicant(s)</b> COHEN, ALON	
	<b>Examiner</b> JONATHAN WILLIS	<b>Art Unit</b> 2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendments filed on 07/23/2009. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. Claims 21-41 have been added. Claims 21-41 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 27, 34, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what exactly a logic request and a UI request consists of in order to differentiate between the two different requests.

4. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim recites that a data request is required to be routed through a pseudo server in **step (b)**, but then the data request is denied if it is not routed through a pseudo

Art Unit: 2441

server in **step (d)**. It is unclear how requests are denied for not being routed in a subsequent step from when they were previously required to be routed through a pseudo server.

Examiner suggests either removing **step (d)** or changing the data request requirement in **step (b)**.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 21-22, 26-29, 33-36 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2001/0042171 A1 to Vermeulen.**

7. In regard claim 21, **Vermeulen** teaches a server-side data-processing machine (see “*Remote Server*,” in **Fig. 1 [14]**) for securely and efficiently fulfilling network requests, the server-side data-processing machine comprising:

(a) a data-access engine, residing in a server memory (see *inherent file storage component inside Remote Server*, e.g. “*Servers 14...Such servers dedicated to storing files*,” in **[0025] Lines 7-8**) of server-side data-processing

machine (see *“Remote Server,” in Fig. 1 [14]*), for communicating (see *“communication between Proxy and Remote Server, in Fig. 2 [12] [14] [22] [24]”* with at least one pseudo server (see *control program in Proxy Server, e.g. “proxy server 12...executes a control program stored in main memory 34...to perform the functions described in...FIG. 2,” in [0026] Lines 1-11*) residing in a secondary memory (see *“RAM of Proxy server, in Fig. 3 [34]”*) of a secondary data-processing machine (see *“Proxy Server,” in Fig. 1 [12]*),

wherein said at least one pseudo server (e.g. *“a control program,” in [0026] Lines 1-11*) includes a server-logic module (e.g. *“a control program...containing a sequence of control instructions to perform the functions described in...FIG. 2,” in [0026] Lines 1-11*) and a user interface (UI) (see *interface of proxy to receive client output initiated by client user, e.g. “an interface to the client,” in Fig. 3 [35]*) for fulfilling data requests (see *“File Request” and “File Transfer,” in Fig. 2 [21]*) originating from a client memory (see *“requests inherently originated from the clients RAM,” in Fig. 4 [43]*) of a client-side data-processing machine (see *“Client,” in Fig. 2 [11]*), and

wherein a data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server (see *“Client” “Proxy” and “Remote Server,” in Fig. 1 [11] [12] [14]*, e.g. *“If client 11 wants to load a file from server 14, this request is handled via proxy server 12,” in [0022] Lines 9-11*).

8. In regard to claim 22, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing machine (see *"Remote Server," in Fig. 1 [14]*) of claim 21, wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network (see *inherent Control Program of Remote Server in a Remote Network, in Fig. 1 [13][14]*) and at least one of said at least one pseudo one server (see *Control Program of Proxy Server, e.g. "a control program stored in main memory 34," in [0026] Lines 1-11*) is located in a second network (see *Network between client and Proxy, in Fig. 1 [11] [12]*, e.g. *"A client 11 is connected to a proxy server 12," in [0022] Lines 2-3*) having said client-side data-processing machine (see *"Client," in Fig. 2 [11]*).

9. In regard to claim 26, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing machine (see *"Remote Server," in Fig. 1 [14]*) of claim 21, wherein a local data request from said client-side data-processing machine (see *"Client," in Fig. 2 [11]*) for data stored in one of said at least one pseudo server can be fulfilled directly by said one of said at least one pseudo server (e.g. *"If client 11 requests a file that has already been loaded and therefore is still contained in the cache, the proxy server will send this file directly from the cache to the client," in [0022] Lines 13-15*).

10. In regard to claim 27, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing machine (see *"Remote Server," in Fig. 1 [14]*) of claim 21, wherein a logic request or a UI request from said client-side data-processing machine (see *users operating client to*

Art Unit: 2441

*request data, e.g. "control program may be an Internet browser...inputs by a user of the client," in [0028] Lines 2-3)* can be fulfilled by said at least one pseudo server (e.g. *"If client 11 requests a file that has already been loaded and therefore is still contained in the cache, the proxy server will send this file directly from the cache to the client," in [0022] Lines 13-15).*

11. Claims 28-29 and 33-34 are corresponding system claims of apparatus claims 21-22 and 26-27 respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 35-36 and 40-41 are corresponding method claims of apparatus claims 21-22 and 26-27 respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 23-24, 30-31, 37-38 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen in view of US 6,604,143 B1 to Nagar et al. (hereinafter referred to as Nagar).**

15. In regard to claim 23, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing machine (see *“Remote Server,” in Fig. 1 [14]*) of claim 22, wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate (e.g. *“control program adapted to...return the computed hash code to the client via an interface of server 14,” in [0025] Lines 4-7*) with other client-side data-processing machines (e.g. *“several clients are connected to such a proxy server via an internal corporate network (intranet),” in [0023] Lines 4-5*), but

**Vermeulen** does not teach that the data-access engine communicates with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers residing within said first network as claimed.

However, **Nagar** teaches the data-access engine (see *“Server Program,” in Fig. 2 [220]*) communicates with other client-side data-processing machines (see *multiple computers and intranet as the client-side, in Fig. 2 [202] [206] [208]*) via pseudo servers residing within said first network (see *multiple proxy servers inside intranet, in Fig. 2 [202] [228] [230]*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to add the features of using a plurality of proxy servers to communicate with clients inside of an intranet network, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen**, since both of the references are directed toward proxy caches, hence would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.



One would be motivated to do so because it is well known that in distributed computer network systems (e.g. "Computer network 13 with its servers 14 represents a distributed file system," **from Vermeulen in [0022]**), multiple system components may be used in a larger system to facilitate larger amount's of requested information in order to reduce the load on a single system component,

16. In regard to claim 24, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing machine (see "Remote Server," **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 21, but

**Vermeulen** does not teach wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server as claimed.

However, **Nagar** teaches a data-access engine (see "Server Program," **in Fig. 2 [220]**) is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between (see "Response Filter," **in Fig. 2 [232] and Fig. 3 [320]**) said data access engine (see "Server Program," **in Fig. 2 [220]**) and said at least one pseudo server (see "Proxy Server," **in Fig. 2 [228]**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to add the features filtering content between a proxy server and a remote server, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen**, since both of the references are directed toward proxy caches, hence would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because **Nagar** discloses the current problem with state of the art filtering methods (e.g. *“Generally, once the software developer writes a system that performs any filtering of information, what is filtered or how it is filtered cannot be modified except by having the software developer create a whole new filtering system,”* **from Nagar in Col. 1, Lines 41-44**) and discloses the need for improvement in content filtering (e.g. *“Therefore it is desirable to improve the filtering of information.”* **from Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 4-5**), and the incorporation of **Nagar** into **Vermeulen** could enhance **Vermeulen** by allowing for current modification of filter rules in filtering incoming and outgoing proxy request data as it is well known that proxies are filtered (e.g. *“The proxy server with plug-in filters allows for easy modification of what information to filter and how to filter it,”* **from Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 11-13**).

17. Claims 30-31 are corresponding system claims of apparatus claims 23-24; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

18. Claims 37-38 are corresponding method claims of apparatus claims 23-24; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

19. Claims 25, 32, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen in view of US 6,356,941 B1 to Cohen.

20. In regard to claim 25, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing machine (see *"Remote Server," in Fig. 1 [14]*) of claim 21, but

**Vermeulen** does not teach wherein said data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data request according to restrictions set by a network vault as claimed.

However, **Cohen** teaches a data-access engine (see *"Server's Software Module," in Fig. 3 [48]*) is configured to only fulfill said data request (e.g. *"request by a transaction to access stored information," in Col. 13, Lines 42-43*) according to restrictions set by a network vault (e.g. *Security software module 48 examines each such request to determine...whether the user has permission to perform the transaction to the particular network vault," in Col. 13, Lines 43-47*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the feature of restricting the retrieval of the requested stored data by using "network vaults" as disclosed in **Cohen**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen** since both reference are directed toward a accessing stored data, hence would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would have been motivated to do so as Cohen discloses the problems associated with proxy servers and filtered communication and discussed the advantages of using network vaults to increase security (e.g. *"firewalls and proxy servers, can only provide filtering of communication and therefore are not sufficiently robust and secure to permit a direct connection to, and packet exchange with, limited access network 18. Therefore, if a risk is overlooked, the filter will fail. Also, the security*

Art Unit: 2441

*of the firewall and/or proxy server itself can be breached, enabling the intruder to change the declarations for filtering in order to permit unauthorized access through the firewall and/or proxy server. However, the present invention does not require such packet exchange across networks, so no such declarations are needed," from Cohen in Col. 7, Lines 39-50).*

21. Claim 32 is a corresponding system claim of system claim 25; therefore, it is under the same rationale.

22. Claim 39 is a corresponding system claim of method claim 25; therefore, it is under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

23. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5,935,207 to Louge et al.

US 2002/0162020 A1 to Bellaton et al.

US 6,144,996 to Starnes et al.

US 2003/0005080 A1 to Watkins et al.

US 2002/0184403 A1 to Dahlin et al.

US 5,642,515 to Jones et al.

US 2003/0050974 A1 to Mani-Meitav et al.

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2441

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN WILLIS whose telephone number is (571)270-7467. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571)272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JONATHAN WILLIS/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2441  
10/20/2009

/Quang N. Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2441